

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

VICTOR VELASQUEZ,) Case No.: 5:11-cv-03588-PSG
Plaintiff,) **ORDER RE: MEET-AND-CONFER**
v.) **(Re: Docket Nos. 77, 87, 108, and 114)**
CITY OF SANTA CLARA, et al.,)
Defendants.)

Before the court is a filing¹ from Plaintiff Victor Velasquez that provides a status report on the parties' meet-and-confer responsive to the court's prior order "to discuss possible limiting instructions or whether other witnesses, particularly percipient witnesses, should also appear by videoconference in lieu of making a physical appearance in court."² Defendants, too, have offered their take on the meet-and-confer.³ The court agrees with Defendants that, absent an explicit motion for reconsideration, the court will not revisit its prior decision.⁴ The court is, however,

¹ See Docket No. 121.

² Docket No. 119 at 8.

³ See Docket No. 122.

⁴ Motions for reconsideration must comply with Civil L.R. 7-9. See Civil L.R. 7-9(a) ("No party may notice a motion for reconsideration without first obtaining leave of Court to file the motion."); Civil L.R. 7-9(c) ("No motion for leave to file a motion for reconsideration may repeat any oral or written argument made by the applying party in support of or in opposition to the interlocutory

1 willing to assist the parties move past their impasse in meet-and-confer. To that end, the parties
2 shall appear for a status conference this Wednesday, February 5, 2014, at 4:30 pm. Telephonic
3 appearances may be made without leave of the court.

4 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

5 Dated: January 31, 2014

6 
7 PAUL S. GREWAL

8
9
10 United States Magistrate Judge
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

order which the party now seeks to have reconsidered. Any party who violates this restriction shall
be subject to appropriate sanctions.”).